

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, To Increase Revenue Requirements for Electric and Gas Service and to Increase Rates and Charges for Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2003.

(U 39 M)

Application 02-11-017
(Filed November 8, 2002)

Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Investigation 03-01-012
(Filed January 16, 2003)

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company Pursuant to Resolution E-3770 for Reimbursement of Costs Associated with Delay in Implementation of PG&E's New Customer Information System Caused by the 2002 20/20 Customer Rebate Program.

(U 39 E)

Application 02-09-005
(Filed September 6, 2002)

**DECISION GRANTING REQUEST TO DELAY FILING OF
TESTIMONY ON MARGINAL COSTS, REVENUE
ALLOCATION, AND RATE DESIGN**

On December 23, 2002, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed a petition to modify Decision (D.) 89-01-040, which established a rate case plan for filing and processing rate cases. PG&E's petition seeks a six-month extension of the filing date for its testimony on marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate

design (also known as Phase 2 testimony), given the delays in processing PG&E's revenue requirement request compared to the schedule anticipated in D.89-01-040. No party opposes the requested delay.

PG&E's request to delay filing its Phase 2 testimony until August 6, 2003 is reasonable given the adopted schedule for processing PG&E's revenue requirement request and we will grant it. Although PG&E styled its request as a petition to modify D.89-01-040, it is clear that PG&E intended the modification to apply to this case only, as opposed to modifying the rate case plan for all future rate case applications. Therefore, we will not modify D.89-01-040 but simply grant the delay in filing in this instance.

Because the Executive Director granted PG&E a day for day extension of the filing deadline while its petition was pending, the motion to shorten time to respond is moot and therefore denied.

Comments on Proposed Decision

This is an uncontested matter in which the decision grants the relief requested. Accordingly, pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 311(g)(2), the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment is being waived.

Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the Assigned Commissioner and Michelle Cooke is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. PG&E's request to delay filing its Phase 2 testimony until August 6, 2003 is reasonable given the adopted schedule for processing PG&E's revenue requirement request.

2. Although PG&E styled its request as a petition to modify D.89-01-040, it is clear that PG&E intended the modification to apply to this case only.

3. Because the Executive Director granted PG&E a day for day extension of the filing deadline while its petition was pending, the motion to shorten time to respond is moot.

Conclusions of Law

1. PG&E's request to delay filing its Phase 2 testimony until August 6, 2003 should be granted.
2. We need not modify D.89-01-040 but simply grant the delay in filing in this instance.
3. PG&E's motion to shorten time to respond is denied.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) request to delay filing its testimony on marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate design is granted.
2. PG&E shall file its testimony on marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate design on August 6, 2003.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.